

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow are meant to impart precision to the claims, and more particularly point out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 were rejected. Claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-14, 16-17, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0147847 (“Brewster”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,047,030 (“Forsyth”). Claims 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewster in view of Forsyth and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,162,697 (“Markel”).

The Prior Art Fails To Teach: “causing a first information handling system, associated with a first client and a first user, to: . . . in response to a configuration specified by one or more files of the first information handling system, perform at least one of the following operations: automatically translate the excerpt from an XML format into a non-XML format, so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with the first information handling system; and automatically translate the excerpt from the XML format into an alternate XML format, so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with the first information handling system”

As amended, independent claims 1, 5, and 9 recite, inter alia: “causing a first information handling system, associated with a first client and a first user, to: . . . in response to a configuration specified by one or more files of the first information handling system, perform at least one of the following operations: automatically translate the excerpt from an XML format into a non-XML format, so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with the first information handling system; and automatically translate the excerpt from the XML format into an alternate XML format, so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with the first information handling system”.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner cited Brewster and, in particular, Figure 2, paragraphs 16-17, and portions of the claims in Brewster. These cited portions are inapposite to the claimed invention for at least two reasons. First, Brewster discusses conventional processing of documents at the *server*, as shown in Figure 2 and discussed in paragraphs 16-17: “The

company employee 4 submits a document to the server 14 (step 18) . . . Once on the server, the data in the submitted document is extracted and converted into an XML document.” (Brewster, para. 17 (emphasis added).) This disclosure of a server in Brewster contrasts with translation from a first format to a second format by a ***first information handling system, associated with a first client and a first user***, as claimed. Accordingly, claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable.

Second, Brewster discloses that “use [of] an XSL stylesheet to translate the XML document into a viewable format (step 26).” (Brewster, para. 17.) By way of explanation, Brewster specifies that an administrator on the server side may decide that a viewable format resulting from the use of a stylesheet with one particular style would be very appealing to a first recipient while different viewable format would be more appropriate for a second recipient. (Brewster, para. 16.) In Brewster system, the server thus translates for the purpose of a optimizing *multiple viewable formats for various recipients at different client computers*, as opposed to a client, associated with an information handling system, translating to achieve ***compatibility with only the information handling system***, as claimed.

The Prior Art Fails To Teach: “perform at least one of the following operations: automatically translate the excerpt from the non-XML format into an XML format so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with a second information handling system associated with a second client and a second user; and automatically translate the excerpt from the alternate XML format into an XML format so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with the second information handling system associated with a second client and a second user”

Claim 1, 5, and 9 recite, inter alia: “perform at least one of the following operations: automatically translate the excerpt from the non-XML format into an XML format so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with a second information handling system associated with a second client and a second user; and automatically translate the excerpt from the alternate XML format into an XML format so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with the second information handling system associated with a second client and a second user”. The cited prior art does not teach these claim limitations.

For example, the Brewster system involves use of XSL stylesheets to perform conventional translation of XML documents. (Brewster, Figure 2 (step 26) (“Administrator accesses XML Document and Uses XSL Stylesheet to Translate Data 26”).) Thus, Brewster arguably discloses translation *from XML* to another format. However, in addition to the

fundamental failure of Brewster to disclose translation by a information handling system associated with a client computer as discussed above, Brewster also fails to disclose automatic translation from a “*non XML format into an XML format*” or from an “*alternate XML format into an XML format*”, as claimed. Thus, claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable for this additional, separate reason.

The Prior Art Fails To Teach: “automatically store the excerpt in a folder that is preselected by the first user; allow only the first user to selectively determine accessibility to the folder”

Claim 1, 5, and 9 recite, inter alia: “automatically store the excerpt in a folder that is preselected by the first user; allow only the first user to selectively determine accessibility to the folder”. The cited prior art does not teach these claim limitations.

As perhaps the closest, yet still inapposite cited reference, Forsyth discloses a group communication method for a wireless communication device. As an example of its disparate teachings, the Forsyth system discloses forums, (Forsyth, Fig. 6.), but not *folders*, as claimed. As another example, the fundamental principle in the Forsyth system involves unlimited invitation to join its forums: “Forums is shared by all participants, so that any participant can invite someone new to the Forum.” (Forsyth, col. 5, lines 26-35 (emphasis added).) In contrast, the claimed invention requires that *only the first user can selectively determine accessibility* to the folder. Thus, claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable.

Claims dependent on the patentable independent claims are patentable both by their dependency and in their own right.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2638 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then such an extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2008

/James W. Soong/
James W. Soong
Registration No. 40,824

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
CUSTOMER NUMBER **64494**
1900 University Avenue, Fifth Floor
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 328-8500
Fax: (650) 328-8508